



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RESCH'S "LOGIA."¹

DR. RESCH's arduous labors have now culminated in this handsome volume, in which he gives in parallel columns of Greek and Hebrew what he conceives to be the original gospel. That gospel, according to his now well-known theory, was called "the Logia." It was composed in Hebrew by Matthew shortly after the death of Christ, was the main source of the three synoptic gospels, was used by Paul and John, and continued for many centuries to be known to the church writers. To varying translations from it are due not only the variations of the synoptic evangelists, but also many of the countless variant readings which crowd the *apparatus criticus* of the New Testament—especially those of the "western text" and of the early Fathers. To reconstruct it "all Hebraizing texts which point to a Hebrew original" may be used from the synoptists, also the "Agrapha," besides many passages which Dr. Resch's criteria enable him to select from the gospel of John and the epistles of the New Testament.

The evidence for this comprehensive and imposing theory, of which the foregoing brief summary can pretend to give but an imperfect account, has appeared insufficient to nearly all New Testament scholars, and criticisms already made over and over again by competent reviewers need not here be repeated. The present volume is simply the practical working out of the theory in detail. In reconstructing the "Logia" the first two chapters of Matthew and of Luke are disregarded, as they were derived from the *Βίβλος Γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, published elsewhere by Dr. Resch; of the other chapters there is included more than four-fifths of Matthew (out of 1023 vss. 813 vss. and 19 parts of vss.) and nearly six-sevenths of Luke (out of 1019 vss. 855 vss. and 17 parts of vss.); together with two-thirds of Mark (out of 678 vss. 448 vss. and 18 parts of vss.).² There is also some material suggested by John, the epistles, and the Apocalypse, or

¹ *Die Logia Jesu nach dem griechischen und hebräischen Text wiederhergestellt. Ein Versuch.* Von ALFRED RESCH. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898. Pp. xxxiv + 302. M. 10.

² According to the view of Bernhard Weiss, to which Resch's theory is in some respects akin, but thirty-two passages of Mark, comprising only 262 verses, are dependent on the "Apostolic Source" or "Logia."

taken from apocryphal or patristic sources. The whole is carefully arranged in orderly chapters and sections, each with its heading.

Unfortunately the work itself is done with a fanciful arbitrariness which the following characteristic example, taken at random, fairly illustrates. Mark 4:26-29 has appeared to many scholars to be a secondary form of the parable more accurately represented by Matt. 13:24-30, and has been, for that reason, ascribed by Weiss to the "Logia." Resch denies the identity of the two parables, but, although thus deprived of the main support for Weiss' view, holds fast to the idea that Mark's parable came from the "Logia." The evidence consists in the fact that John 12:24 and 1 Cor. 15:36 f. contain references to a grain of wheat, and that a number of early writers use not quite exactly one or another of the three passages, or develop in their own way a similar line of thought; and further in a reading of Codex Colbertinus. This twelfth-century MS. of the Old Latin (as edited by Belsheim, whose editions have, at best, to be used with caution) reads, namely, at Mark 4:27, quite unsupported and, one would say, by an obvious scribal transposition: "et dormiat et *semen* surgat diem et noctem et germinet et crescat, dum nescit ille." Out of this material Dr. Resch constructs the following, which he asks us to accept as a Greek representation of the original of Mark's parable. I give the ordinary text of Mark in a parallel column:

Mark 4:26-29.

(26) καὶ ἔλεγεν· οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλην τὸν σπόρον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

(27) καὶ καθεύδῃ καὶ ἐγείρῃται νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν, καὶ ὁ σπόρος βλαστᾷ καὶ μηκύνῃται ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός.

(28) αὐτομάτῃ ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶτεν στάχυν, εἶτεν πλήρη σῖτον ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ.

(29) ὅταν δὲ παραδοῖ ὁ καρπός, εὐθὺς ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, ὅτι παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμός.

Resch, Logia viii, 18-20.

(18) καὶ ἔλεγεν· οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς κόκκος σίτου βληθῇ εἰς τὴν γῆν,

(19) καὶ καθεύδῃ ὁ σπόρος καὶ ἐγείρῃται νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ βλαστᾷ καὶ μηκύνῃται, ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν.

(20) καὶ γίνεται πρῶτον χόρτος, εἶτεν στάχυς, εἶτεν πλήρης σῖτος ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ· ὅταν δὲ ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, ὅτι παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμός.

It should be added that Dr. Resch's three verses are marked with a dagger, to indicate that their "original verbal form is especially uncertain," and that for eight words (here underlined) variant readings of equal value (*gleichwertige Varianten*) are given in footnotes.

Comment on all this is unnecessary, especially when the following amazing sentences, relating to the matter, are quoted from the *Paralleltexte zu Matthäus und Marcus*: "The radical kinship between John 12 : 24 and Mark 4 : 26 ff. is shown in the differing words for the seed : σπόρος (Mark 4 : 26) = σπέρμα (Clem. Rom.) = κόκκος σίτου (Theophil., Iren., John, Paul, also Aphraates) = כֶּרֶם, which is used in Targum and Mishna in the sense 'granum' (Fürst, I, 271)" (p. 154); and, "The kinship between Mark 4 : 26 ff. and 1 Cor. 15 : 37 and John 12 : 24, which appears prominently in the extra-canonical parallels, can only be explained by a text of the pre-canonical source in which the sleep or death of the grain of seed thrown into the earth was declared to be necessary in order that it might awake and fructify" (p. 156).

The companion parable, Matt. 13 : 24-30, Dr. Resch also ascribes to the "Logia." As evidence he uses the fact that Epiphanius gives a very free reproduction of it, probably derived from a Manichæan source. He says (*Paralleltexte zu Matthäus und Marcus*, p. 145) : "The divergences [between Matthew and Epiphanius] are of such a character that they are explicable only as differences of version and redaction, and thus bear witness to the fact that the parable and its interpretation are derived from the Source." In fact, he is inclined to think that the Manichee had preserved our Lord's words in some respects better than the gospel of Matthew. As to this argument it can only be said that the passage in Epiphanius is interesting and worth investigating, but that it is certainly founded on the canonical Matthew, and does not prove anything whatever about the "Logia." The volume before us is the product of an interminable series of similar examples of the fallacy *non sequitur*.

Dr. Resch has several startling bits of historical construction relating to his "Logia." He says that it was signed at the end by its author Matthew, and he makes this out by putting at the end of the book the list of apostles, closing with καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, καὶ ἐμὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον. This is based on a fragment of the Jewish-Christian *Gospel according to Matthew* known to Epiphanius, in which our Lord names the apostles : ἐξελέξαμην Ἰωάννην . . . καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, καὶ σὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου ἐκάλεσα, καὶ ἠκολούθησάς μοι. But the whole passage quoted by Epiphanius is obviously founded on our canonical gospels and sheds no light on their sources.

Another discovery is that the originator of the "western text" of the gospels was the same as the originator of the canon of four gospels,

and was the Jewish-Christian "presbyter Aristo of Pella" (*Theologische Studien B. Weiss dargebracht*, p. 110). Further, it appears that the MS. of the Logia in Hebrew was kept in the library at Cæsarea, and read there (with some difficulty, as Dr. Resch suggests) by the redactor of the pseudo-Ignatian epistles and the Apostolic Constitutions, who refers to it by its title of τὰ λόγια (*Paralleltexte zu Lucas*, pp. 810 ff.). This last point deserves a word. The passage in question is *Ps.-Ign. ad Smyrn.*, iii, which quotes verbatim Acts 1:11,³ introducing it by φασὶ γὰρ τὰ λόγια. Dr. Resch appears to be ignorant of the fact that τὰ λόγια was commonly used in the early centuries to designate the Holy Scriptures, a usage of which Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, pp. 172 ff., gives copious examples. We may add, in passing, that when Dr. Resch finds in the occasional Old Testament use of the Hebrew דְּבָרִים (e. g., 1 Kings 11:41) as a book-title to mean "acts" a justification for his title, Τὰ Λόγια Ἰησοῦ = דְּבָרֵי יֵשׁוּעַ, it would have been better to mention that in those cases no Greek version translates דְּבָרִים by λόγια.

The collections of material which Dr. Resch has published in the *Agrapha*, and especially in the *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte*, have permanent usefulness, but his strange inability to see what does and what does not constitute reasonable proof renders worthless all his results. The present book contains results, with little or no new material, and its value is proportionally slight.

JAMES HARDY ROPES.

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL,
Cambridge.

RESCH has given us the prolegomena to his Hebrew "Logia" in his *Paralleltexte*, I, 83-152, where his arguments regarding the language of the primitive gospel are set forth, and his views as to the character of the various Greek translations which he assumes, and their relation to the original, are expressed at some length. What he says respecting the nature of the Hebrew of his reconstructed gospel is merely this, that it is "the idiom used by Delitzsch, Dalman, and Salkinson in their translations of the New Testament" (*loc. cit.*, pp. 107 f.). This is rather indefinite, to be sure. The translations of Salkinson and Delitzsch (or Delitzsch-Dalman) differ widely from each other at just this point,

³ Dr. Resch has wrongly omitted the article δ before ἀναλημφθῆς in printing the passage from Pseudo-Ignatius.

the kind of Hebrew in which they are made.⁴ The former strove to imitate the classical language, with the result that its renderings were often either hopelessly awkward or else untrue to the original. Delitzsch's New Testament employed a curious artificial idiom of its own, constructed partly from the Old Testament Hebrew, partly from the Hebrew of the Mishna, with the principal aim of following the Greek as closely as possible. His translation, finally revised by Dalman in 1892, was well suited to its purposes; it is hardly necessary to say, however, that those who believe in a primitive Hebrew gospel could not look here for the idiom which they suppose to underlie our Greek texts. It is, therefore, to be regretted that Resch has not expressed himself more definitely. It is very likely the fact that his aim is not so much to reconstruct the "original Hebrew" as to furnish an objective demonstration of the theories advanced in his exhaustive *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte*. If this is the case, the question of the type of Hebrew employed by him loses somewhat in importance; but it is far from being a matter of comparative indifference, for in numerous places the success or failure of his demonstration depends on this very question of the idiom postulated; moreover, he proceeds everywhere on the tacit assumption that at least one of the several translators followed *closely* a text resembling the one which he presents.

Comparison of the other Hebrew versions of the New Testament shows that Resch's translation is based chiefly on Delitzsch-Dalman. This version is often reproduced without change, or nearly unchanged, as, for example, in Log. xxii, 34-43 = Luke 16:1-8; sometimes it is abandoned in favor of Salkinson; again, in many places Resch goes his own way. As a rule, however, from which deviations are only occasional, his Hebrew is the result of an extensive, though superficial, revision of Delitzsch; the chief purpose of the revision being to imitate more closely the wording and order of the Greek. It must be borne in mind that the text which he translates is very frequently a mixed text which he himself has constructed, and that his theory requires him to take into account a multitude of variant readings, and provide for them, so far as possible, in the Hebrew. This being the case, it is plain that the task of remodeling was no easy one, but that a great amount of labor must have been expended on it.

As to the merits of the Hebrew version which he has thus made,

⁴See DALMAN in *Hebraica* (= *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*), Vol. IX, pp. 228 ff.

the verdict must be decidedly unfavorable. It is a success neither on the linguistic nor on the critical side. So far as it is his own work, it is clumsy and inaccurate, and, in every way, most unpleasant reading. In the first place, his attempt to model the Hebrew closely on the Greek of our gospels (a very dubious undertaking, even in the hands of an expert) has resulted disastrously. The following examples may serve to illustrate this: viii, 5, **וַיֵּץ וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא בִּאֲחֵי כִי אִם אֶל צֹאן** (*εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλῶτα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ*). This is impossible Hebrew. xxxii, 40, **וַיְהִיָּה נֶכֶן הַתְּלִמִּיד פְּרִבִּי** = *κατηρτισμένος δὲ ἔσται ὁ μαθητὴς ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ*. xxxiii, 27, **וַיַּחֲפֹל כְּדִבֵּר** = *προσηύξατο, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών*. There are a good many such passages, in which the translation is made to fit the Greek exactly, but with a total sacrifice of Hebrew idiom. An illustration of the way in which the attempt to follow the Greek tenses results in confusion is afforded by xxviii, 47. The Greek (Luke 14 : 9, Cod. D) reads : *καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ εἶπη* ("var." *ἔρει*) *σοι κτλ.* This was rendered by Delitzsch : **וּבֹא הַקְּרָא וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיךְ**. In Resch the reading is : **וּבֹא הַקְּרָא וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיךְ**, which is strange Hebrew, to say the least. In iv, 4, by simply transposing into the Greek order Hebrew clauses which in another order (as, *e. g.*, in Delitzsch) would be unobjectionable, mere nonsense is obtained. This is, perhaps, the most striking example of utter disregard of Hebrew syntax to be found in the book. The danger of this method of tinkering the translation of another, without paying due heed to rules of grammar, is particularly well illustrated in xi, 55–57, the denunciation of Capernaum. In 55 the city is first masculine (**אֶתְּהָ**, and masculine adjective), then feminine (**תְּהָרְדִי**, also footnote, **תְּהָרְדִי**); in 56 it is feminine (**בְּתוֹכֶיךָ**); in 57 it is again masculine (**מִמֶּנֶּךָ**). Cf. the versions of Delitzsch and Salkinson, and Resch's *Paralleltexte*, III, 187 ! Another illustration is xiii, 11 (*cf.* Delitzsch), which, in the form given by Resch, defies construction.

It is to be noticed that, in spite of this mechanical method of fitting translation to text, there are many passages in which Resch has not followed his own Greek. Such, for example, are iv, 2 (*cf.* Delitzsch-Dalman); iv, 8 (the word **וַיִּשְׁכֶּם** taken from Delitzsch, where it is in place); vii, 37; ix, 6, 40, where **עֲטוּפִים** is not a translation of *ἐσकुμένοι*, but of *ἐκλελυμένοι* (here Resch really had an opportunity to make a plausible correction of the received text, but did not take it); x, 7; xi, 42; xxiii, 9; xxvii, 41; etc. See also ii, 13, 16; both quotations

from the Old Testament, where his Hebrew neither corresponds to his own Greek nor follows the Old Testament reading; iii, 9, where for three lines his Hebrew (quoted from Isa. 61:1 f.) does not at any point correspond to his Greek.

In other respects, also, Resch's Hebrew is not above reproach. In v, 7, for example, the perfect tense בקש is out of place. In vi, 21, the adjective אנשים is used in a way that is not permissible. In viii, 19, he has misunderstood his Greek; hence the strange כְּאֵלֶּךָ. ix, 40, read איש instead of אנשים. xv, 26-30, the genders are sorely confused; see especially 29! In xxiii, 28, כאשר is used in a false way. Notice also ii, 11, ואחרֵי האֵלֶּה; vii, 40, השִׁית לְבֹר = "he repented;" xiii, 10, וישִׁלִּיכוּהוּ אֲחוּר, etc. In vi, 40; ix, 26; xi, 55 (note); xv, 30; xvi, 31; xxxv, 9, he has constructed forms which the Hebrew grammarians would not recognize. xxiv, 1, 2, he renders τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐλθεῖν δεῖ by הַטְּבוֹת צְרִיכִין לְבוֹא, and τὰ κακὰ ἀνάγκη ἐλθεῖν by הָרָעוֹת צְרִיכִין לְבוֹא; צְרִיכִין being apparently intended as feminine plural ending. For an example of a rendering that is mere nonsense, see ii, 4, where John the Baptist is made to decline the honor of baptizing Jesus in the words: לֹא אוּכַל לְקַחַת אֶת הַשֵּׁלֶל. Resch evidently supposes this to be a translation of οὐ δυνατόν ἐστίν ὅτι τὸν ἀρπαγμόν⁵ παραλαμβάνω, adopted by him from an extra-canonical source.

The point of chief interest in Resch's new version, and that which he had principally in view in preparing it, is the attempted demonstration of an original Hebrew source, which was used by those who compiled our Greek gospels. Students of the New Testament will turn first of all to the evidence of this nature presented in the book before us; for it is to be presumed that one who has gone over the whole ground so thoroughly will have found and set forth whatever proof is to be had. But here, again, the reader is doomed to disappointment. The book is even weaker on the critical than on the philological side.

On every page "variant readings" are recorded; very often the attempt is made, with evident painstaking, to explain two or more Greek words of different signification by a single Hebrew word; in a few cases the attempt is made to show that one of the Greek translators misunderstood the original, or translated from a corrupt text. But, aside from the fact that the underlying theory of manifold translation breaks down completely, again and again (as in vi, 34, 36, 39, 42; vii,

⁵ In his *Paralletekte*, II, 58, Resch speaks of this word ἀρπαγμόν = *rapinam* as "dunkel." Can there be any doubt that it owes its origin to the ἀρπαγμός, *rapina*, of Phil. 2:6?

37; ix, 6, 15; xii, 32; xvi, 38; xvii, 23, 25; xviii, 6; xxxiv, 48), the way in which Resch deals with the evidence before him in single cases destroys at the start all confidence in his work. The reader can hardly believe his eyes, for example, when he sees Resch emend ἔνδυμα γάμον, xxviii, 66, to ἐνδύματά μου (!), and translate by בְּגָדִי, in the face of external evidence, common sense, and his own text in 64 and 65.

In his *Paralleltexte*, *loc. cit.*, p. 108, Resch has remarked that the LXX translation "offers many and instructive analogies, which may aid in the reconstruction of the original Hebrew text in the New Testament." But in his use of these "analogies" Resch shows a most complete absence of critical judgment, as well as a surprising lack of acquaintance with the Hebrew language. Take, for a striking example, his reconstruction (viii, 22) of the clause of Matt. 13:44 reading: *ὃν εὐρὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔκρυψεν*, "[treasure] which a man found, and hid." The footnote reads: "Tatian, *δρύττειν*, Mt. *κρύπτειν*. Vgl. Amos ix. 2: *אִם יִחְתָּרוּ* = LXX: *ἐὰν κατακρυβῶσιν*, al. *κατορυγῶσιν*." Accordingly (?) the Greek is restored as follows: *ὃν εὐρὼν τις ὤρυξεν καὶ ἔκρυψεν*, and the Hebrew original is given as *אִשֶּׁר מִצָּאָה אִישׁ וַיִּחְתָּרְהוּ וַיִּטְמְנֵהוּ*. Passing over the fact that the assumption on which the argument is based, namely, that the context in which the one Greek "variant" is found closely resembles that containing the other, is not true, what could *וַיִּחְתָּרְהוּ* possibly mean here? The verb is not used in this way either in classical or in late Hebrew, and the form given is grammatically impossible in the present context.

A fair sample of the "parallel translations" in our gospels is found in xi, 55: "And thou, Capernaum, who hast been exalted to heaven." As is well known, the best-attested Greek reading (Matt. 11:23; Luke 10:15) is *μὴ ὑψωθήσῃ*, which must then be interpreted, not without difficulty, as a question. Other MSS. offer *ἢ ὑψωθείσα*, the reading of the received text. Resch explains these two readings as derived, respectively, from *הַמְרוֹמָם* (*sic*) and *הַמְרוֹמָם*. Passing over the obvious fact that the first letter of this *μὴ* was derived, by a copyist's error, from the preceding *Καφαρναουμ* (*cf.* the Lewis Syriac in Matthew), the clause *הַמְרוֹמָם עַד הַשָּׁמַיִם*, in which *ה* is regarded as the interrogative particle, would be lame at best; and that a Greek translator who knew even a little of the Hebrew language could render it by *μὴ ὑψωθήσῃ* (!) is quite beyond belief.

In most of the cases of double translation adduced by Resch, this mechanical treatment of the Greek texts is combined with disregard of the actual meaning and use of the Hebrew word; as, for example, in

xxv, 48, where καὶ μαρτυρία πνεύματος παρακλήτου is rendered וְבִעֲדוֹתֵי הַקְּבוּצָה רִיחַ. Perhaps the extreme example of this sort is to be found in xxxi, 34, where the word חָבַל (left unpointed) is made to explain the words ὠδίν and παγίς, respectively, in the "parallel passages" (!) Luke 21:34 and 1 Thess. 5:3. Equally striking for its disregard of Hebrew usage is xxxii, 5, where the first word of John 13:1, πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς, is said to be a translation of מִקֶּדֶם; while the reading of Matt. 26:17, τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἁζύμων, is explained as the same word read מִבְּקֶדֶם! In xii, 20, "Whoever gives a cup of water . . . shall by no means lose his reward," there are two readings: ἀπολέσῃ (transitive) and ἀπόληται (intransitive; μισθός being the subject). Resch explains that the latter is a translation of יֵאָבֵד; the former, of יִאָבֵד. But acquaintance with Hebrew usage would have shown him that this is impossible. אָבַד is a causative piel, meaning, in the first instance, "to destroy." In such a passage as xxvii, 8 ("gaining the whole world and losing his soul"), where Resch also employs it, it is quite in place as the translation of ἀπολέσῃ; but in the context before us it could not possibly be used. Even worse is vi, 34 (נִשָּׂא, נִשְׂא), where the only possible translation of Resch's Hebrew is: "Do not hide yourself from your creditor"! The three or four other instances of the kind upon which Resch bases his argument have even less claim to serious attention than those already mentioned.

In conclusion, it must be said that, so far as this translation is concerned, Resch has contributed nothing of value to the discussion as to the origin of the gospels. He has not, in this book, pointed out any characteristic Hebrew idioms or constructions, or succeeded at any point in making his claim of a primitive Hebrew gospel seem plausible. And if the possibility of the existence of such a gospel were admitted, there could certainly be no reason for supposing that the peculiar product before us bears any close resemblance to it. It is a pity that a scholar of so great industry and wide learning as Resch should have wasted his time on this version, which has no redeeming features.

CHARLES C. TORREY.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Andover, Mass.